

REMARKS

Applicants filed this the parent application before the PTO had rules for numbering each paragraph.

A. SPECIFICATION AMENDMENT

We added the reference to the parent application to the specification as requested. We also changed "2" to "3" in the paragraph that begins, "State of the Art."

B. SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

We canceled claim 16 and amended claim 19 to fix the "a the" language and other noted informalities. We also amended the clause that begins, "injecting contaminated liquid" to specify that initially, the vapor is within the first shell, and liquid containing contaminants remains on the inner surface of the first shell.

Raising the pressure of the vapor directs the vapor to any area of lower pressure. In this case, it is the input to the other shell.

C. REJECTION UNDER § 103(a)

We traverse the § 103(a) rejection of Moss (Patent No. 4,597,835) or Lichtenthaeler (Patent No. 1,819,517) in view of Schnitzer (Patent No. 3,904,122).

Though Moss rotates its surfaces about an axis, it operates very differently than the claimed invention. Whereas the boiling and condensing occur on the surfaces of the shells in applicants' device, in Moss, "Vapour is fed to housing 4 from a reboiler ... by way of vapour inlet 10, whilst liquid can be removed from housing 4 for return to the reboiler by means of liquid outlet 11. Col. 4, line 47. In applicant's invention, water flows in one direction along any one shell surface, and the vapor flows in the same direction. In Moss, however, "Vapour and liquid pass radially in countercurrent, ... the liquid moving outwardly whilst the vapour moves radially inwardly. Col 4., line 51.

In addition, Moss's plates appear to be present to "define a labyrinthine path" for the liquid and vapor. Col 4., line 56. The concentric shells in applicants'

invention do not define a labyrinth. Their surfaces form the boiling and condensing surfaces.

Amended claim 19 and new claim 20 also require “first and second concentric shells” having a common axis. The plates in Moss do not share the same axis.

Thus, Moss is not at all pertinent to the claims. Lichtenthaeler also is pertinent. It is not a boiler-condenser; it is a “Heating System for Liquids.” The liquid moves in a circle because it is pumped between cylinders.

The office action cites Schnitzer as a secondary reference because it raises pressure. Because of the different operation of primary references, Moss and Lichtenthaeler, for the claimed invention, any pressure-raising teaching in Schnitzer is irrelevant. Even though Schnitzer also rotates plates, the plates are not concentric shells. Thus, the reference is not relevant to the obviousness inquiry.

Therefore, we submit that the combination of references does not create *prima facie* obviousness necessary to sustain a § 103 rejection. Accordingly, we request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

D. CONCLUSION

We complied with all the requirement and overcame the objections and rejections. If the PTO believes that a telephone conference would resolve any remaining issues, we would gladly participate.

September 14, 2007

/Michael D. Harris/

Michael D. Harris, Reg. No. 26,690
Attorney for Applicants

SoCal IP
Law Group LLP

310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Phone: (805) 230-1350 x246 • Fax: (805) 230-1355
Email: mharris@socalip.com